

City of Seattle

ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Proposal Name: **Citywide Skatepark Plan**

Address of Proposal: **The proposed adoption of a Citywide Skatepark Plan is a non-project action that will be applied City-wide**

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

The proposal is non-project action; it is the adoption of a Citywide Skatepark Plan. The intent of the Skatepark Plan is to outline skatepark typologies and siting criteria, and to identify potential future skatepark sites. Note that *only* the proposed Skatepark Plan is the subject of the following SEPA analysis; individual sites, *if chosen*, will be subject to project specific environmental review.

SEPA DETERMINATION: Determination of Non-Significance (DNS)

BACKGROUND DATA

On February 21, 2006, the Seattle City Council established a Skatepark Advisory Task Force, comprised of representatives from all quadrants of the City, to develop a comprehensive skatepark system plan for Seattle that encompasses a citywide needs analysis, inventory of existing and proposed facilities, creation of skatepark typologies, siting criteria, and possible locations. The Skatepark Advisory Task Force has developed preliminary recommendations for a draft plan, which is the subject of this SEPA Analysis and Threshold Determination, for building a citywide network of safe and accessible skateable terrain and skateparks.

The draft plan will be provided to the Board of Park Commissioners and to the City Council by mid-December 2006, and a final plan will be presented to City Council for adoption by January 31, 2007.

PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

The proposal is non-project action; it does not directly propose any construction activity. This Analysis and subsequent Threshold Determination is for the adoption of the proposed Citywide Skatepark Plan. The draft Plan, attached to the SEPA Checklist, provides the decisional criteria for the siting of a variety of skateparks, equitably distributed throughout the City. Consistent with the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), review is being undertaken now, prior to adoption of the Plan while it is still in preliminary draft form. Minor revisions may be

made in the Plan as the process moves forward. However, any significant modifications may trigger additional review and/or a new Threshold Determination under SEPA. There are four components of the Plan; the framework of assumptions, skatepark typologies, siting criteria and the list of proposed sites. Prior to crafting the siting criteria, the Task Force developed a set of assumptions to provide a framework within which to draft the siting criteria. These assumptions are applicable to all the skatepark typologies:

- Emphasis will be given to sites that are ‘gray to gray’, i.e. the conversion of asphalt or other paved surface to a skatepark facility;
- Proposed sites will not:
 - Be sited in designated environmentally critical areas, natural areas or designated greenbelts;
 - Interrupt planning projects underway or infringe upon recently completed projects, e.g. Pro Parks Levy and NMF projects;
 - Be sited on private property; and/or
 - Replace/remove existing active uses (ex. ball fields, playgrounds).
- Proposed sites will:
 - Have adequate area available for the appropriate size facility; and,
 - Be distributed equitably throughout the City.

The Task Force proposed four typologies for skatepark facilities within the City of Seattle, from the very small, a skatedot, to a regional skatepark. The four typologies are outlined below with the associated siting criteria. Note that the checklist has also identified a range of potential impacts associated with each typology, to the extent possible, absent an actual project design. Based on the above assumptions, the Plan provides the following typologies and siting criteria:

Proposed Skatepark Typology & Siting Criteria¹

Skatedot (also referred to as “Skateable Terrain”) - 20 to 1,500 sq.ft.; A Skatedot is composed of small skateable elements along paths, as part of streetscapes or in parks, and its design:

- Seeks to seamlessly integrate skateable terrain both into small neighborhood parks and throughout the city’s non-park areas by identifying existing spaces that already are or that could be used for skating.

¹ The siting criteria for the skatedot are unique and not applicable to other typologies. Siting criteria for the other typologies builds on the previous.

Skatespot - 1,500 to 10,000 sq.ft.; Similar in size to a single tennis court. These facilities could accommodate a narrow range of skill abilities and terrain due to their size, with up to 13 users at one time. A Skatespot:

- [Is] compatible with existing uses (ex. near an active area of the park rather than contemplative space), consider adjacent uses, and adjacent landscaping/surfaces is compatible with safe skate surfaces;
- [Is situated to] limit off-site impacts to residential communities as consistent with city code, i.e. noise and lighting;
- Allow[s] for clear, passive observation by parents, emergency services, police and the public;
- [Is] in close proximity to public transit, and have good foot, bike and vehicular access;
- [Is] easily developable and [has] minimal construction impediments;
- Allow[s] for the creation of a safe and secure environment; providing for separation from vehicular traffic, vehicular and pedestrian access, and ease of routine maintenance;
- [Is] located in a highly visible area with moderate to high pedestrian traffic, in an existing or new multi-purpose park, or in close proximity to other public facilities;
- Can be integrated into a larger park space that provides other park amenities;
- Consider[s] sun and shade and protection from rain and wind;
- Include[s] a space for size appropriate community viewing; and,
- Consider[s] the environment for the well being of skateboarders, including noise and air quality.

District Skatepark - 10,000 to 30,000 sq.ft.; About the size of two tennis courts. These facilities could accommodate a wide range of skill abilities and 10 - 30 users at one time depending on configuration. A District Skatepark:

- Offer[s] adequate separation from other facilities/program at site;
- [Is] in close proximity to [a drinking] fountain, trashcans, restroom;
- Offer[s] potential space for nearby action-oriented sports activities and events, such as BMX or climbing;
- Include[s] the possibility of lighting, or integration with existing lighting;
- [Has] expansion potential;
- [Is served by] adequate parking;
- [Is] compatible with existing uses (ex. near an active area of the park rather than contemplative space), consider adjacent uses, and adjacent landscaping/surfaces is compatible with safe skate surfaces;
- [Is situated to] limit off-site impacts to residential communities as consistent with city code, i.e. noise and lighting;
- Allow[s] for clear, passive observation by parents, emergency services, police and the public;

- [Is] in close proximity to public transit, and have good foot, bike and vehicular access;
- [Is] easily developable and [has] minimal construction impediments;
- Allow[s] for the creation of a safe and secure environment; providing for separation from vehicular traffic, vehicular and pedestrian access, and ease of routine maintenance;
- [Is] located in a highly visible area with moderate to high pedestrian traffic, in an existing or new multi-purpose park, or in close proximity to other public facilities;
- Can be integrated into a larger park space that provides other park amenities;
- Consider[s] sun and shade and protection from rain and wind;
- Include[s] a space for size appropriate community viewing; and,
- Consider[s] the environment for the well being of skateboarders, including noise and air quality.

Regional Skatepark - greater than 30,000 sq.ft.; Similar in size to a Little League baseball or football field. This facility could accommodate 50 - 300 users at a time and be sufficient in size for competitions, concessions and other revenue generating options. A Regional Skatepark:

- [Has] the capacity for concessions;
- Promote[s] action oriented sports activities and events;
- Offer[s] adequate separation from other facilities/program at site;
- [Is] in close proximity to [a drinking] fountain, trashcans, restroom[s];
- Offer[s] potential space for nearby action-oriented sports activities and events, such as BMX or climbing;
- Include[s] the possibility of lighting, or integration with existing lighting;
- [Has] expansion potential;
- [Is served by] adequate parking;
- [Is] compatible with existing uses (ex. near an active area of the park rather than contemplative space), consider adjacent uses, and adjacent landscaping/surfaces is compatible with safe skate surfaces;
- [Is situated to] limit off-site impacts to residential communities as consistent with city code, i.e. noise and lighting;
- Allow[s] for clear, passive observation by parents, emergency services, police and the public;
- [Is] in close proximity to public transit, and have good foot, bike and vehicular access;
- [Is] easily developable and [has] minimal construction impediments;
- Allow[s] for the creation of a safe and secure environment; providing for separation from vehicular traffic, vehicular and pedestrian access, and ease of routine maintenance;
- [Is] located in a highly visible area with moderate to high pedestrian traffic, in an existing or new multi-purpose park, or in close proximity to other public facilities;

- Can be integrated into a larger park space that provides other park amenities;
- Consider[s] sun and shade and protection from rain and wind;
- Include[s] a space for size appropriate community viewing; and,
- Consider[s] the environment for the well being of skateboarders, including noise and air quality.

Initially, sites were suggested for inclusion in the plan by City staff and members of the public. Over 130 sites were suggested to the Task Force at the beginning of the process. These sites were visited over the summer and evaluated using the framework of assumptions and siting criteria. Finally, based on the framework of assumptions, siting criteria, skatepark typologies and public input, the following thirty (30) sites have been chosen for consideration in the draft Citywide Skatepark Plan at this time. Note that no decisions have been made on any of the sites; the plan will be used to prioritize the list of sites that may be developed. Existing and/or planned skatepark facilities (e.g. Ballard Bowl, Lower Woodland Playfield Skatepark, Jefferson Park Skatepark, etc.) have been noted in the Plan to ensure an appropriate distribution of facilities.

The list of thirty sites represents an initial analysis. As the draft Plan is reviewed by the Board of Park Commissioners, the Superintendent, Mayor and City Council, there will likely be adjustments to the list of sites. Sites currently on the list may be removed and new sites may be added. The larger importance of the Citywide Skatepark Plan is the framework of assumptions, skatepark typologies and siting criteria which will guide future siting decisions for years to come. Individual sites, once selected and funding is allocated, will be subject to project level environmental review to ensure compliance with applicable Federal, State and local regulations.

Sites have also been identified which are not currently owned by Seattle Parks & Recreation and that have not undergone a planning process for future park development. These sites, the Northgate Park and Ride site and the four reservoir sites, will be considered as sites for skate features only after Parks has reached agreement with the property owner, and after a public planning process has taken place and a skate feature is included in the park plan.

Sites Currently Under Consideration

<i>Sector</i>	<i>Proposed Location</i>	<i>Type of Facility</i>	<i>Address</i>
Northwest Sector			
1	Interurban Trail	Skatedot	N 138 th St & Linden Ave N
2	Sandel Playground	Skatedot	9053 1 st Ave NW
3	Gasworks Park	Skatedot	2101 N Northlake Way
Northeast Sector			
4	Lake City Playground	Skatespot	26 th Ave NE & NE 123 rd St
5	Cowen Park	Skatespot	5849 15 th Ave NE
6	Maple Leaf Reservoir	District	Roosevelt Way NE and NE 85 th St
7	Northgate Park-n-Ride	District	NE 112 th between 3 rd and 5 th Ave NE

Sector	Proposed Location	Type of Facility	Address
8	Roosevelt Reservoir	District	15 th Ave NE and NE 73 rd
9	Magnuson Park	Regional	7400 Sand Point Way NE
Central West Sector			
10	Magnolia Playfield	Skatedot	2518 34 th Ave W
11	Myrtle Edwards Park	Skatedot	3130 Alaskan Way W
Central East Sector			
12	Eastlake and Allison	Skatedot	Eastlake Ave E and E Allison St
13	Garfield-Medgar Evers Pool	Skatedot	2323 E Cherry St
14	Judkins Park & Sam Smith Over Look	Skatespot	2150 S. Norman, 23 rd Ave S & S. Atlantic St.
15	Pratt Park	Skatespot	1800 S. Main
16	Miller Playfield	Skatespot	400 19 th Ave E
Southwest Sector			
17	Alki Beach	Skatedot	area near Alki Bathhouse: 2701 Alki Ave SW
18	Denny Middle School Athletic Complex	Skatespot	South of SW Community Center: 2801 SW Thistle St.
19	Hiawatha Playfield	Skatespot	2700 California Ave SW
20	Delridge Playfield	Skatespot	4458 Delridge Way Sw
21	Fairmount Playfield	Skatespot	5400 Fauntleroy Way S
22	Roxhill Park	Skatespot	2850 SW Roxbury
23	High Point Playfield	District	6920 34 th Ave SW
24	Myrtle Reservoir	District	35 th Ave SW and SW Myrtle St
25	West Seattle Stadium	District	4432 35 th Ave SW
26	Westcrest Park	District	9000 8 th Ave SW
Southeast Sector			
27	John C. Little Park	Skatespot	6961 37 th Ave S
28	Brighton Playfield	District	6000 39 th Ave S.
29	Rainier Beach Playfield	District	8802 Rainier Ave S
30	Rainier Playfield/ Genesee Playfield	District	3700 S. Alaska St.

While the Citywide Skatepark Plan identifies thirty initial sites for consideration as skateparks, final project priority will be determined through the collaborative efforts of Park staff and the public, and subject to available funding. The individual projects will follow all applicable Park and City policies and procedures including internal review by design and engineering professionals, all appropriate levels of public involvement, and may be subject to review and a threshold determination under SEPA depending upon the scope of the project and the characteristics of the project site.

Note that this SEPA analysis and subsequent decision is *only* for the draft Citywide Skatepark Plan, specifically the four components of which are attached to the SEPA checklist. The site specific locations for the thirty individual sites are not the subject of this analysis and will be reviewed separately, as indicated above as actual project plans are prepared.

PUBLIC COMMENT

In June 2006, more than a hundred people attended three public meetings and an open house where community input was given on:

- The draft criteria for locating future skateboard facilities in Seattle;
- The types and range of facilities Seattle should have; and,
- Nominations of potential sites that the Task Force and consultant should evaluate for possible inclusion in the Citywide Plan.

During July and August all the nominated sites were evaluated for their potential to be included in the draft list for the Citywide Plan. Evaluations were completed in September and the draft list was prepared. Parks staff held a second round of public meetings on October 2, 5 and 7, 2006 to solicit public comments on the draft list of sites under consideration. Over 250 people attended the three meetings and staff received approximately 300 e-mails, letters and phone calls in addition to comments received at the meetings. Even though the Skatepark Plan is focused on the framework of assumptions, skatepark typologies, siting criteria and the list of proposed sites, which likely will not be the final list of sites included in the plan, the overwhelming majority of comments were directed towards the specific sites and not the assumptions, typologies, or siting criteria. These sites received generally favorable comments: Judkins Park, West Seattle Stadium, Magnolia Playfield and Roxhill Park. The Myrtle Reservoir, Genesse Playfield, and Maple Leaf Reservoir sites raised concerns and generally negative responses.

Following the issuance of the threshold determination for the Citywide Skatepark Plan, there will be a fourteen (14) day public comment period. Following the SEPA public comment and appeal periods, Parks staff will present the Plan to the Seattle Board of Park Commissioners (Board) on November 9, 2006 and a public hearing will be held on December 14, 2006. Notice of this presentations and hearing will be given and there will be an opportunity for public comment. Following the presentations and hearing, the Board will make a recommendation on specific sites to be included in the Plan to the Superintendent for his decision. The Skatepark Plan, with any changes recommended by the Board and as approved by the Superintendent, will then be forwarded on to the Mayor and City Council for adoption.

Note that individual project sites identified in the Skatepark Plan will be subject to a public involvement process in accordance with the Department's Public Involvement Policy. Citizens, groups and organizations affected by any proposed skatepark will be included in the development of any site specific project. At a minimum, standard signs will be posted at the proposed project site and the local community organization (e.g. Neighborhood or Community Club or Council) will be contacted and allowed input. If the proposed project exceeds thresholds outlined in the Public Involvement Policy, a public meeting will be held. Individual skatepark projects may also warrant additional review under SEPA as indicated above.

ANALYSIS - SEPA

Initial disclosure of potential impacts from this project was made in the applicant's environmental checklist, dated September 19, 2006. The basis for this analysis and decision is formed from information in the checklist, plan materials attached to it, and the lead agency's experience with review of similar projects.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 23.05.665) discusses the relationship between the City's code/policies and environmental review. The Overview Policy states, in part, "[w]here City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact; it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation". The Policies also discuss in SMC 23.05.665 D1-7, that in certain circumstances it may be appropriate to deny or mitigate a project based on adverse environmental impacts. This may be specified otherwise in the policies for specific elements of the environment found in SMC 25.05.675. In consideration of these policies, a more detailed discussion of some of the potential impacts is appropriate.

Short Term Impacts

The proposal is a non-project action and no short term impacts are anticipated upon adoption of a Citywide Skatepark Plan. However, the following temporary or construction-related impacts could be expected as a result of the implementation of site specific skatepark projects²: Decreased air quality due to suspended particulate from building activities and hydrocarbon emissions from construction vehicles and equipment; increased dust caused by construction activities; potential soil erosion and potential disturbance to subsurface soils during grading, excavation, and general site work; increased traffic and demand for parking from construction equipment and personnel; increased noise; and consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources.

Several adopted codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code regulates site excavation for foundation purposes and requires that soil erosion control techniques be initiated for the duration of construction. Erosion will be prevented by implementation of a required Temporary Erosion Control and Sedimentation Plan. Best Management Practices, such as the use of a stabilized construction entrance, mulching and hydro seeding will be implemented at the site to minimize erosion during construction. Excavation work will take place during the drier months to minimize rain impacts during grading. The Street Use Ordinance requires debris to be removed from the street right of way, and regulates obstruction of the sidewalk. Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. The Building Code provides for construction measures and life safety issues. The Noise Ordinance regulates the time and amount of construction noise that

² Note that depending on the scope, breadth and location of each individual skatepark, project specific environmental review may be required, with an associated public process consistent with Seattle Parks Policy and Procedures Manual.

is permitted in the city. Compliance with these codes and/or ordinances will lessen the environmental impacts of the proposed project.

The impacts associated with the construction are expected to be minor and of short duration. Compliance with the above applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most adverse short-term impacts to the environment. However, noise issues warrant further discussion.

The checklist indicates that construction activities will be confined to weekdays. Hours of construction are limited by the Seattle Noise Ordinance, SMC ch. 25.08, to 7:00 a.m. and ten 10:00 p.m. on weekdays (SMC 25.08.425). The reality of the local construction industry is that most contractors work from 7 a.m. to 4 p.m.; the likelihood that any construction activities will occur up to 10 p.m. is slight. The Noise Ordinance also regulates the loudness (dB) of construction activities, measured fifty (50) feet from the subject activity or device. The City has dedicated Noise inspectors to monitor construction activities and respond to construction complaints. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance will prevent any significant adverse short term noise impacts and thus no further conditioning is necessary or warranted.

Compliance with applicable codes, ordinances and regulations will be adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation.

Long Term Impacts

The proposal is non-project action and no long term impacts are anticipated upon adoption of the Citywide Skatepark Plan. Before a final decision is made on any of the sites listed in the Skatepark Plan, potential construction activities and the operation of a skatepark on that site will be subject to additional environmental review. The following long-term environmental impacts could be expected, depending upon the site chosen:

Stormwater

Any skatepark will be constructed of concrete, an impervious material, in place of pervious turf or other impervious surface. Since no motorized vehicles drive within the skatepark facility, stormwater run-off from the skatepark is considered "clean" and may be infiltrated into the soil directly with no adverse impacts to water quality. Stormwater runoff from specific sites may be infiltrated or routed to a nearby storm drainage facility, depending on the site characteristics and/or the availability of existing facilities.

ECA

As indicated in the checklist, four (4) of the proposed sites are located within or nearby an area which is considered an Environmentally Critical Area (ECA)³. No sites

³West Seattle Stadium has a man-made slope east of the proposed site location for this area which may contain unstable soils; Myrtle Edwards Park is located in a liquefaction-prone area; and portions of Genesee Playfield and Judkins Park are built on top of old landfill sites

have been chosen which lie within designated wetland, riparian corridor, wildlife habitat, flood prone area, steep slope and/or potential or known slide area ECAs. If a skatepark facility is actually chosen for any the four sites, design and all construction activities must be consistent with the applicable provisions of the City's ECA Ordinance.

Plants & Wildlife

Seattle is home to a variety of state and federally protected species, both plants and animals. As any project moves forward the Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW) database will be consulted and WDFW staff contacted as appropriate to ensure that there will be no significant adverse fish or wildlife impacts associated with any skatepark facility. It is likely that the vast majority of the sites will be located in flat open areas. Site vegetation will be inventoried and with the exception of grass, preserved to the extent feasible.

Open Space/Access to Recreation

Adoption of the Citywide Skatepark Plan will not have any significant adverse open space/access to recreation impacts. However, the siting of individual skatepark facilities may impact park area(s) which are used for passive recreation and unstructured play, depending on the size of the facility. As each individual project moves forward, potential significant adverse impacts to open space will be assessed and appropriate mitigation required accordingly.

Traffic & Parking

Adoption of the Citywide Skatepark Plan will not require any parking nor generate any traffic. However, individual projects may have traffic and/or parking impacts. The smaller the facility, the less likely it is to require parking and/or generate any vehicle trips. The checklist indicates that parking may be considered for a District or Regional facility and that trip generation will be evaluated at the project level to determine if there are any significant adverse traffic related environmental impacts. None of the thirty sites on the project list are funded at this time. The Citywide Skatepark Plan is a plan that may be implemented over the next twenty years. Traffic volumes and parking demand may change significantly between the adoption of the plan and any actual construction. As such, it is appropriate to measure the demand and volumes once there is an actual project.

Noise

As indicated in the Checklist, typical urban noises already exist in the vicinity of the sites. Parks staff has measured noise levels at the Seattle Center Skateboard Park when skaters were present. Sound levels ranged from 62 to 70 dB. Change in noise of 10 dB is typically perceived as a doubling of noise, whereas a change of less than 3 dB is not normally perceptible to human hearing.

The majority of recent noise analysis has been in conjunction with highway or airport projects. The following table from the Illinois Department of Transportation is illustrative of general noise levels associated with various land uses.

dBA	Description of Land Use
57 (Exterior)	Lands on which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose.
67 (Exterior)	Picnic areas, recreation areas, playgrounds, active sports areas, parks, residences, motels, hotels, schools, churches, libraries, and hospitals.
72 (Exterior)	Developed lands, properties, or activities not included in the other categories.
-- --	Undeveloped Lands.
52 (Interior)	Residences, motels, hotels, public meeting rooms, schools, churches, libraries, hospitals, and auditoriums.

General playground and sport fields generate noise levels between 62 and 74 dB. General traffic noise levels range from 52 - 72 db depending upon traffic volumes and time of day. Any future skatepark would likely generate noise levels similar to those measured at the Seattle Center Skateboard Park of 62 - 70dB. Measured skatepark sound levels are no higher than general ambient sound levels. Sound measurements will be taken at each site, as they are chosen to move forward at the project level to determine the potential for significant adverse noise related environmental impacts. Sound levels may change dramatically between the adoption of the plan and any actual construction. As such, it is appropriate to measure ambient sound levels at any proposed site once there is an actual project.

Aesthetics

As has been said, beauty is in the eye of the beholder. There is nothing about a skatepark within a park which raises significant adverse aesthetic issues so long as the area where the skatepark is to be located does not have Landmark status or some other unique attribute. There may be the potential for graffiti, but no more so than other hard surfaces in the area. Some people may find the skatepark a visual intrusion in the area while others find the structures associated with the baseball and softball fields a visual intrusion.

Historic Preservation

The Olmsted Brothers had a hand in many of the designs of many of Seattle's parks. In order to preserve this legacy, any skatepark facility will be sited to avoid potential impacts to nearby historic features. The following potential sites are or could be designated as an Historic landmark:

- Gasworks Park - Historic Landmark designation pending
- Hiawatha Playfield - Designated Landmark site, Olmsted designed

- Cowen Park - Olmsted influenced design, Cowen Park Bridge is on the National Register of Historic Places
- Warren G. Magnuson Park - Identified as a potential Historic District for listing to the National Register of Historic Places.

These sites represent unique design challenges due to their historic nature. If any of the sites is chosen and funding allocated for the construction of a skatepark, the facility design will be subject to review by the Department of Neighborhoods Landmarks Preservation Board and potentially the State Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation to ensure that the siting of any skatepark facility within these parks does not cause any significant adverse historic preservation related environmental impacts.

None of the above generally identified environmental impacts are considered significant and thus no mitigation is warranted or necessary. However, specific projects may generate significant adverse environmental impacts which warrant mitigation. No long-term environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the adoption of a Citywide Skatepark Plan and thus no mitigation is warranted or necessary.

DECISION

This decision was made after the responsible official, on behalf of the lead agency, reviewed a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination and final decision on application of SEPA's substantive authority and mitigation provisions. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21.C), including the requirement to inform the public of agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

- (X) Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(C).
- () Determination of Significance. This proposal has or may have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. AN EIS is required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(C).

Signature: <<signature on original>>
 David Graves, AICP
 Senior Park Planner, Major Projects and Planning Section
 Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation

Date: October 25, 2006